authorization of $15 million is proposed for this purpose.

Grants and technical assistance to multicounty economic development districts for formulating overall economic development plans.

Additional Federal grants of 10 percent for development facility projects which are part of an approved district development plan, as a special incentive to encourage communities to work together.

Federal grants and loans for designated economic development centers in order that economic development districts will have resources sufficient to sustain their growth.

For the last two purposes I am recommending an authorization of $50 million. To allow ample time for the States to prepare well thoughtout action programs, no projects would be approved under this authorization until 1 year after enactment of the legislation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

This enlarged and redirected program of economic development will be administered by the Department of Commerce, which has also been responsible for the existing experimental program. The legislation I am proposing would create the position of Economic Development Administrator in that Department. The functions and powers of the existing Area Redevelopment Administration would be tansferred to a successor organization to be created by the Secretary of Commerce to administer the new act.

Many other Federal programs also can contribute to the economic development of distressed areas. It is essential that these programs be closely coordinated to make sure resources are used with maximum effectiveness in reaching the common goal of a higher standard of living for the people of these regions. Therefore, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to work closely with interested departments and agencies in achieving a coordinated Federal effort. It is especially important that this effort be carried forward in close cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The antipoverty program will help people improve their ability to obtain and hold a job. This program is designed to increase the number of jobs available to those who want to work. Obviously both efforts are essential to the future growth of distressed areas. I intend to see that they work closely together toward the common objective.

CONCLUSION

There are three important things to remember about this program. First, it is designed to extend opportunity to those now deprived of a full chance to share in the blessings of American life. As such it has a call upon the moral conscience of every citizen.

Second, it will benefit all Americans. The experience of the last 30 years has shown conclusively that the increasing prosperity of any region of this country increases the prosperity of the Nation. We have truly become a national economy. Higher incomes for the people of Illinois or Arkansas mean increased markets for automobiles from Detroit and steel from Pittsburgh. Poverty in one area slows progress in other areas.

Third, the job can be done. We have the resources and the skill to extend American abundance to every citizen and every region of this land. This program will help give us the instruments to match our determination to eliminate poverty in America.

The conditions of our distressed areas today are among our most important economic problems. They hold back the progress of the Nation, and breed a despair and poverty which is inexcusable in the richest land on earth. We will not permit any part of this country to be a prison where hopes are crushed, human beings chained to misery, and the promise of America denied.

The conditions of our depressed areas can and must be righted. In this generation they will be righted.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

AREA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TITLE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate has just received the President's message on area and regional economic development. In this message, he has made recommendations which are focused upon the economic needs of distressed areas, and directed at providing the conditions which can lead to growth and to improvement of the towns and counties in which the people of these areas want to maintain their residence.

I welcome the recommendations of the President, and I am pleased to note that he has based these recommendations primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and also the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, which helped develop the Appalachian bill the Congress enacted this year. I know that the committees of both the House and Senate will give careful consideration to these proposals, and I want to comment only briefly on the main points made in the message to the Congress.

As one who has spoken and voted for the accelerated public works program, I am glad that a program of direct grants for 50 percent of the cost of constructing public facilities related to economic development is included in the message. More importantly, the request for an annual authorization of $250 million for this program, including a provision for greater assistance for communities whose financial condition makes them unable to raise the required local share, would place this program on a regular basis—a procedure I have long urged to meet the needs in many areas of our country that want to work to share in the economic growth and affluence of the rest of the Nation.

The request for an annual authorization of $170 million for a revolving fund which would provide loans for commercial and industrial facilities, for connected public facilities, and for working capital guarantees, is one which deserves close study by the Congress. In addition, the new recommendations for authorizations of funds for technical assistance on a multicounty basis, and in connection with the full development of regional resources, are proposals which I know the committees will review carefully.

The ARA program has been one which has stimulated enterprise and created jobs in many parts of our country, but it has also had its problems which have been recognized as the agency developed its experience to meet different needs in different sections of our country. I hope that attention will be given to these proposals, to a study of the accomplishments of the program since its beginning in 1961, and to the need for revisions and improvements which many of us have urged in the Senate for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE BUDGET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a crisis which is developing in the Nation's vital soil conservation efforts. I speak of the administration's proposal to cut $20,130,000 from the Soil Conservation Service budget for 1966, and to establish a revolving fund to absorb this loss.

The dominant conservation problem on the non-Federal rural lands today is soil erosion. A recent study made by the Department of Agriculture—the "National Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs"—reveals that conservation problems are inadequately treated on 62 percent of the country's cropland, 73 percent of non-Federal pasture and range, and 55 percent of non-Federal forest and woodland.

Great strides, however, have been made in recent years toward developing proper conservation practices. In the forefront of these efforts has been the Soil Conservation Service. Of particular importance has been the technical assistance provided by the Service to the individual landowner in helping him to plan and develop conservation practices.

It is proposed to cut funds for these technical services from the budget and to substitute in its place a revolving fund. This would force soil conservation districts, or individual landowners and operators, to pay to the Service up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished.

Mr. President, this proposal will seriously jeopardize water resource development in this country. We are not moving fast enough in this area now. We need more funds, not less. I believe that the revolving fund plan is unworkable and can lead only to a decline in proper

conservation practices. Districts unable to offset the $20 million would be forced to reduce proportionately the technical staff providing assistance.

In Indiana, for instance, the impact of the budget cut would be severe. More than $230,000 would have to be raised each year to maintain the program at present levels. About 70 man-years of technical time would be lost without the funds.

Perhaps this budget cut is proposed as an economy measure. Action to reduce Government spending is laudable in many instances, but here we have a clear case of false economy. By failing to fund this relatively small cost for valuable technical know-how, we will bring about enormous dollar losses in soil, crops, water and wildlife.

The problem of water resource development and land management is national in scope and affects every one of our citizens. We cannot expect the small landowner to bear the entire burdent of conservation costs. He already pays a percentage of construction costs and all of the maintenance costs. It should be recognized that urban people, too, benefit significantly from a balanced watershed development. Urban residents want unpolluted streams, recreation areas and attractive countrysides. The public interest requires an increase—not a decrease—in funds for these purposes.

I urge every Senator to study this problem carefully and to join me in opposing any effort to reduce or hinder our land and water conservation programs.

GENERAL SCHRIEVER ON COMPUTER SYSTEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a speech on the use of computers in the Air Force, which operates more than 500 of them as the heart of its systems management program, recently came to my desk. It was written by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, and was given at the 11th Annual Data Processing Conference of the American Management Association.

Because of the importance of data processing and because of the contents of General Schriever's remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVOLUTION AND CHALLENGE OF SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

It is a distinct pleasure to take part in this conference on "Management and the Computer." I see from the progam that the computer portion of your conference has been covered by the speakers and panelists who are experts in data processing and management information systems. I would like to discuss the management aspect, drawing specifically on the Air Force experience in managing the largest military development program in the Nation's history—the ICBM.

Let me begin with a few observations about the place of the computer in the management picture. Military requiremcnts, of course, have greatly stimulated the pace of computer development. Today the Air Force operates more than 500 computers. They are at the heart of many of our systems, especially command and control systems. They enable us to perform tasks that would be simply impossible without them.

It seems to me that the new challenges to computer systems and designers and those which constantly face management are similar in at least two ways:

First, the computer, like the management approaches we adopt, must be placed in its proper perspective in our way of life. It must be fitted into our free enterprise system. Among other things, it will be measured by its contribution to our national economy and to our industrial base.

Second, the computer, like any other resource, must be capable of supporting decisionmaking in the most economical and effective manner. It must be competitive among other alternatives.

Simply stated, my view of the computer in management is that it should assist top management in making better big decisions. A misuse of the computer is to use it to participate in all decisions. I think this kind of misuse often occurs because the computer is still a mystery to much of the top management. Too many specialists and interpreters get into the act—in the so-called software area. We must work toward computer systems which will allow the manager and the computer to communicate directly, and we believe that technology can provide this capability.

The Air Force faced the same challenges in managing the ballistic missile program. We not only needed to take full advantage of the free enterprise system, and find the approach which best supported the decisionmakers, but we also needed to make fullest use of our valuable scientific, technological, and industrial resources. I believe that the lessons we learned remain valid today and for the years ahead.

At the outset of the ICBM program in 1954 we faced two categories of problems—one which involved technology and one which involved management. A committee of prominent scientists advised us that both categories of problems could be solved, but that each demanded a special approach. Our success in solving the technological problems is a matter of record. The extent to which that success depended upon the evolution of management needs to be better known.

During the late 1940's and early 1950's the management problems associated with weapon systems acquisition had been relatively simple. We could normally start by designing a basic aircraft and then install the "black boxes," such as communications equipment, radar, armament, and other more or less off-the-shelf items. In short, our approach involved straightforward engineering. A systems engineering approach carefully intergating the various subsystems was not necessary.

But the ICBM required a whole new dimension of management. It involved a whole variety of technical problems, which often had to be solved simultaneously. The overall task—from initial concept to the deployment of the missiles in operational sites across the Nation—was unprecedented in size, cost, and urgency.

We had the military resources, the scientific resources, the industrial resources, and the manpower to develop this radically new weapon system. But we needed to find the way to harness these resources effectively—to weld them into an effective instrument that could meet the urgent challenge facing the Nation. This was primarily a challenge to management, and the challenge today is not too different from what it was 11 years ago.

Should we meet this challenge by trying to achieve a rapid buildup of Air Force in-house resources, at the cost of many millions of dollars for Government facilities? This is the traditional "arsenal" approach. There were two compelling reasons for rejecting it. First of all, it ran directly contrary to the Air Force philosophy of drawing directly on the Nation's vast scientific and industrial resources. Secondly, and more important, this approach would not allow us to rapidly attract, motivate, and employ all the outstanding scientists, engineers, and managers who were needed.

What was the alternative? After consulting leading scientists and industrial executives, the Air Force decided to reaffirm its basic philosophy of employing the total resources in the scientific and industrial community.

Immediately we faced the question of how to organize and manage this effort. A review of both Government and industrial capabilities revealed that no single organization had sufficient expertise in all the technical fields involved in developing the ICBM. This fact led the Air Force to adopt the concept of an associate contractor team working directly with the Air Force. This concept permitted the Air Force to have a direct contract with each of several major specialized contractors, thus taking advantage of the specialized capabilities available and making possible closer management control.

Because of the size and complexity of the ICBM program it was necessary to form a separate and independent organization to perform the critical function of systems engineering and technical direction (SE/TD). This is a unique discipline which requires an extremely high degree of competence. The associate contractor approach, together with the use of the independent SE/TD group, insured that we made use of the outstanding talent of the Nation, whether in government, industry, or the universities. In addition, the associate contractor structure provide competition in both cost and technical excellence.

The success of this approach is now a matter of record. In spite of the fact that the ICBM program was a pionecring effort on a scale never before attempted and involved a whole new dimension of technical complexity, it succeeded beyond all expectations. The range, payload, and accuracy of today's ballistic missiles far exceed the most optimistic predictions. Furthermore, they were developed ahead of schedule.

We were able to achieve these results through a management approach in which we carried on a number of activities concurrently. These activities included development, test and evaluation; establishment of a logistic system; training of people; construction of technical and operational facilities; and production. If these had been done in sequence, the leadtime for the total system would have been much longer and the overhead costs would have been greater. Thus the concurrency approach made it possible to save both time and money. This latter advantage is not always recognized.

Obviously some degree of concurrency is involved in the development of any major weapon system, but this does not always or necessarily mean concurrency in technical development. I want to stress this point. Concurrency has often been taken to mean stretching the state-of-the-art, but this is not the case. Technology is only one element of the total system acquisition. Depending on circumstances, we can take an approach involving high technical risk, as with the ICBM, or low technical risk, as with the C–141 jet transport or take an approach somewhere in between. But in each case concurrency is involved in the system acquisition cycle.

We must always use judgment in employing this management concept, as we must in employing any management concept. It is simply not possible to take a single management approach and say, "This is the only way to develop a new system." Rather, our

approach should always be appropriate to the task we have to do—considering the size, the cost, the urgency, and technical risk involved, and other relevant factors.

This brings me to a second consideration which has affected the evolution of systems management, and that is the constant challenge to shorten the time cycle for systems development, while at the same time making maximum use of the potential of technology. This problem is not unique to the military. To the businessman it might take the form of the following two questions: Do we want to use today's technology and hardware to build a product that may be equal to or perhaps marginally superior to our competitor's products, but which is available relatively soon? Or do we want to assume a certain risk and build a product which will require some new technology but which will be definitely superior to the products our competitors are building?

To translate these questions into the language of military systems development, the first approach might be called the use of "hardware building blocks." The second would then be called the use of "technological building blocks."

Each of these approaches has certain advantages and certain drawbacks. The use of hardware building blocks minimizes the technological and economic risks, but at the same time it introduces the real risk of early obsolescence. This may not only be dangerous from a military point of view, but may actually cost more money in the long run. The use of technological building blocks, on the other hand, involves technical risk, but it was this approach which enabled us to create today's superior ballistic missile force in time to meet the Soviet ICBM challenge. Future challenges may very well demand that we follow the same approach. With today's broad spectrum of technology and its continuing evolution, there is no doubt that technical superiority is combat superiority.

We must strive to attain the best balance between hardware and technological building blocks, between concurrent and sequential activities, and among the often conflicting considerations of time, cost, technical risk, and operational requirements. We can attain this balance only if we remain clear about the results we need to achieve.

The most important result of this evolution in Air Force management is the strategic superiority which our Nation enjoys today. But there are also a number of substantial side benefits. Let me mention a few of them. First, by relying on the total resources to be found within the scientific and industrial community, we have avoided the buildup of a multibillion-dollar Government network of facilities. Second, we have encouraged and maintained a strong, competent, up-to-date industrial base composed of all areas of technical endeavor. Third, we have insured that healthy industrial competition is always available and flourishes in such specialized fields as guidance, propulsion, reentry vehicles, and so forth. In this way we have not only contributed to building the industrial base for our national space program but have also fostered numerous commercial applications of new technology.

Thus the management approach which evolved in the ICBM development effort not only achieved its objective of creating a superior missile force, but at the same time provided a direct input to the national economy. This fact is worth noting, because we live in an age when neither the military nor the economic aspects of national security can be considered in isolation. Our objective must be superior military strength and a strong economy; both are essential to our overall national security.

Effective SE/TD is still an essential part of system management. We have found that the best way to remove any question as to the complete objectivity and impartiality of the systems engineering/technical direction contractor is to assign the SE/TD function to a nonprofit, nonhardware producing organization. Furthermore, the use of the SE/TD contractor is selective. Where the technical complexity and the systems integration problems do not require unusual capability across the broad spectrum of scientific disciplines, we follow the more traditional methods of systems acquisition.

The challenges of the future will certainly call for further innovations to cope with the complex and demanding tasks ahead of us. These innovations are not to be feared, but welcomed. I do not believe that we shall ever reach a perfectly static set of management procedures, any more than we will ever prevent technology from moving ahead. Contrary to what some people may say, technology has not reached a "plateau." Actually it continues to move forward rapidly, and we must work to keep our technological leadership. We must maintain the technological superiority that is the key to national security. Our management practices must be geared to encourage this superiority.

This is the challenge facing all of us. It is clear that computer technology will make possible far-reaching changes in management. In only a few years it has already had a significant impact on the way we do business—both in the Government and in industry.

We must make sure, however, that the tail does not begin to wag the dog. The goal of management is not merely to evolve toward more complex and more involved methods of procedure. Its objective is not just some theoretical model of completeness and efficiency. Quite simply, its only aim is to get the job done—with speed, effectiveness, and economy. Furthermore, it must enable us to do the job within the framework of our democratic goals and values.

This is the principle which the Air Force has followed in its development of systems management. It has frequently led us to evolve new concepts, and we have not been afraid to depart from tradition. I think the results fully justify this approach, and I am certain that it will be required to meet the challenges of the future.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in a very short time, the President will have submitted proposed agricultural legislation for consideration by Congress.

Every year, I receive considerable mail, and a volume of telephone calls and telegrams, directed to questions or suggestions concerning farm programs—ranging from how to make them better to how to get rid of them entirely. I am certain that all Senators enjoy a similar experience.

I have been struck by certain facts and considerations that run through these letters, and which recur in meetings and discussions I hold with various groups and delegations. These are items, incidentally, that are evident each year when farm legislation is considered.

There is still a high level of misunderstanding between various segments of the urban and rural populations. It is not clearly recognized by all that their ties are close, that interrelationships are continuous and vital, and that even in this age of specialization each is wholly dependent upon the other.

These are not alien worlds. While certain facets of the daily mode of life may vary, both segments assume and carry responsibilities that would be meaningless without the other. The occupational skills and workload of the farm, urban or city dweller may be extremely different but each needs the expertise and help of the other to survive.

The efforts and output of each are inexpugnably entwined in the national welfare. A metropolitan and industrial nation, no matter how strong, could be reduced to a second-rate power, even a debtor nation, without a continuous and even flow of wholesome food supplies. A nation dominated by agricultural interests could only fail to reach its maximum capabilities in growth and outlook.

This Nation has been blessed with a strong and responsive agriculture, and with a viable industrial and business complex. The interests, activities, benefits, and burdens of each blend together.

Six million American workers are needed to supply the farmer with tools, machines, materials, and services for food and fiber production. Farmers bought $41 billion worth of goods and services in 1963—$29 billion for production supplies, and $12 billion for services.

Ten million workers transport, process, manufacture, and sell farm goods. In 1961, manufacturers of food products alone had 1.7 million employees and a payroll of $8.4 billion.

With ever-increasing efficiency, the American farmer now produces enough food for himself and 31 others. We spend only about 19 percent of our take-home pay for food. Britishers spend about 29 percent, Russians 40 percent or more.

Many a factory worker lives in a rural community or is a part-time farmer; many a farmowner lives in town or is a part-time factory worker. Many a farmer enters the business world when he retails his product, sets up his own processing operation, or becomes a stockholder in an allied industry. Many a city dweller has an interest in a family farm or is a gentleman farmer who receives the benefits of commodity and conservation programs.

Examples of the interrelation of rural and urban interests are many and varied. To deny an interdependence is to beg the issue. To misunderstand this fact brings forth criticism from urban interests that are not wholly merited by the farmer. It brings forth indignation from the farmer that should not be directed specifically to the city dweller.

One thing is certain, however: Without an abundance of food, and the means and services to move it to market, both rural and urban consumers would be paying high and premium prices for many a commodity, and a disastrous spiral of inflation would be started.

The second fact that emerges is that, as with no other segment of our economy, agriculture is the least equipped to bring its individual or cumulative production into line with demand so that farm income reflects an equitable return on investment. In no other segment of the economy is there less consensus on how to meet the problem.

Agriculture speaks with a babble of voices. Each commodity group seemingly considers itself a separate entity and evidences little consideration for the others—although their mutual aims are basically the same. Within each commodity group are the divergent interests of producers and the allied interests—the processors, manufacturers, mills, and what-have-you. Add to this a general distrust by geographical regions, and muddied waters only become darker.

Also, it is apparent that, all claims withstanding, no agricultural group or organization—and certainly no national farm association—speaks for agriculture.

Considerable criticism has been voiced about the complexities of commodity programs. The farmer in Indiana, who for the most part has diversified operations, is particularly sensitive on this point—and I suggest rightly so. But I suggest also that any legislation adopted by the Congress is mandated by the very condition it reflects. Until clear and simplified mandates are received from within agriculture, then the legislation that agriculture seeks can only meet the many and diverse claims that it makes.

A third point is that price support programs, initiated by the Congress in the public interest and for the national welfare, have been tarred by some with the black brush of handout to the point that this type of subsidy, if it is a true subsidy, has been distorted to a caricature of its basic meaning.

The concept and intent—in fact, the reality—of price-support operations is that of dollar and cent values placed upon eligible commodities which reflect a minimum fair value to the farmer only when, and if, he places that commodity under loan. Price-support programs do not guarantee a profit to any farmer.

The accumulation of commodity stocks by the Government that began to become burdensome and costly during the 1950's—and with certain commodities at the present time—can be attributed primarily to the aversion within agriculture to place restrictions upon yield. Of what value are general acreage restrictions when yields per acre for all the major commodities are annually surpassing previous records?

Be that as it may, the fact remains that those portions of farm programs that may be considered subsidy-type operations are not limited to agriculture in our economic system. They are unique only in that they are the most open to public scrutiny and the most susceptable to criticism.

I believe that it should be borne in mind, too, that commodity programs are not outright payments for mere services rendered. They are basically loan programs, in which a specified commodity is pledged as collateral. Takeover by the Government occurs when the loan is defaulted. Land diversion and retirement features of farm programs are predicated upon conservation principles which protect our national resources. All are designed to meet a definite need at minimal cost—not only for the farmer but also for all taxpayers.

For those individuals and groups interested in farm legislation, I would commend, and recommend the reading of "Farm Programs and Dynamic Forces in Agriculture," which was prepared by the Legislative Research Service of the Library of Congress and transmitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate. This document was ordered to be printed and appears under date of February 4, 1965, 89th Congress, 1st session.

I find it interesting to note in this detailed and objective report that, in the absence of price-support programs in the years 1961–65, net farm income would have declined by one-half, to about $6 billion a year. In addition to some $6 billion annual losses in farm income, farmers also would have experienced decreases of several billion dollars a year in farmland values—rather than the increases which occurred.

It is also interesting to note in connection with these observations that similar conclusions were reached by study groups of Iowa State University, Pennsylvania State University, and Oklahoma State University.

It is possibly true that, as charged, certain inequities may exist in present price-support legislation—that many benefits accrue to the larger operators, that the higher productive farm units use support programs as a hedge for their overproduction, and that the smallest farm units are not given sufficient legislation protection and incentive.

If these charges are true, then I believe that due consideration should be given to realining support mechanisms so that the national interest is served to the fullest.

The fourth point is that considerable interest has been created over proposed rural development programs and in connection with resource development programs. These are needed and long-awaited proposals. Many benefits have already been derived. Many added benefits will undoubtedly be forthcoming.

However, I suggest that, insofar as our basic concern is for a strong agriculture, we do not get the cart before the horse—and relegate the growing of crops to a mere contingency of rural affairs.

The reason for being of a farmer—large or small—is to grow a needed commodity at a profit which will assure an adequate and even flow of food and fiber to market, and at a fair price to the consumer.

A strong rural America, with an aggressive rural development, rests firmly on a sound and progressive onfarm economy.

The farmer needs to avail himself of all that is part and parcel of our high standard of living. Rural America needs to avail itself of all the advantages and incentives that are encompassed in the principles of the Great Society.

But a clear line of understanding must be maintained between those programs directed primarily at increasing the purchasing power, and the bargaining power, of the farmer and those designed solely to supplement these programs, or as vehicles to aid those farmers forced off the land for want of income.

A fifth point is that I find it paradoxical and tragic that the Department of Agriculture should become the whipping post for so much undue criticism. As the saying goes, "It is flayed if it does, and peeled if it does not."

I make the point that many harsh evaluations of the Department are due to misunderstandings of its role and function.

Perhaps no other department of Government administers so many programs that affect consumers. Certainly, this Department is second to none in its day-to-day concern and efforts to protect and to further the national interests.

A sixth and final point is that the value of agriculture has been downgraded and the image of agriculture has become blurred. I am afraid that much of the fault lies within agriculture itself.

Many within agriculture are now voicing concern that changing population trends, the growth of metropolitan areas, and the increased representation from urban areas will have an adverse effect on agricultural legislation. There is concern that the voice of rural America will be lost in the hurly-burly sounds of megalopolis and that the votes will be cast only on the basis of urban interests versus rural need.

I suggest that this is a false and short-sighted view. I have not supported all farm legislation proposed, but it was not because those city people I represent recommended that the farmer be written off the books.

Whether or not farm legislation as presented this year is acceptable to the majority of the Senate remains to be seen. It will be neither accepted nor voted down, however, on the simple basis of rural vote against urban vote. It will be considered on its merits, and on the basis of fact, need, and feasibility as presently known.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT SALES OF CATTLE TO ITALY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a short time ago Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, in television comments, spoke about the cattle industry. The substance of it was that the Secretary of Agriculture is about to deprive the United States of what had been building into a lucrative cattle export business, at a time when this country is desperately in need of increased overseas trade.

The problem is that the cattle must have health certificates, and as Mr. McCaffrey points out:

The health certificate now provided by the Department of Agriculture contains spaces for 16 head of cattle on a single sheet of paper. When a shipment of 500 heifers or cows is exported to Italy, they may be sold to as many as 500 individual buyers. Each cow must have a certificate to accompany

There is, of course, no indoor plumbing. Until 2 weeks ago, she was able to draw water for cooking and washing from a well on her property.

But the pump broke and she can't afford to have it repaired.

Mrs. Moshoquit said that her nearest neighbors refuse to allow her to use their well unless she pays $1 per bucket of water. Her monthly income is $58 from social security benefits.

She requires only one bucket of water a day. But the nearest neighbor who will let her have the water free of charge lives one-quarter of a mile away.

This can be an agonizing journey in the winter.

Several times last month, Mrs. Moshoquit said, it was so cold inside her house that water she had stored overnight froze into ice by morning.

She doesn't own an automobile, and this adds to her hardship. There is no public transportation in Menominee County.

The closest store is 2 miles from her house. Unless she is willing to pay someone to drive her, she must hike to the store.

Several times a month, Father Marcellus Cabo, pastor of St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Neopit, stops by and serves as chauffeur.

The priest transports her to Keshena, 12 miles distant, to pick up her skimpy allotment of commodities from the food surplus depot.

"The hardest thing, though, is chopping the wood," she said. "After I chop the wood, I'm no good for the rest of the day."

The $58 a week that Edward Kauquatosh, 41, earns as a laborer in the Menominee lumber mill doesn't stretch very far. It has to support his wife, Mary, 45, and their 10 children, ages 8 and 18.

"Last week," he said, "I had to spend my whole paycheck on shoes for the kids."

Edward doesn't smoke or drink. He can't afford such pleasures.

The family's diet mainly revolves around their food surplus allotments. Fresh meat on the table is rare.

The Kauquatoshes usually have to pay a neighbor $5 to drive them to Keshena to pick up their monthly food rations.

Their home is 2 miles from the lumber mill. To save money, Edward eats lunch at home. This means he has to walk to and from work four times a day.

The medium-size framhouse in which Laura Wayka and Harriet Waukau live is bursting with humanity. It is home to 22 people.

The girls, sisters, each with three children, are supported by welfare aid.

The house, owned by their parents, is occupied by their grandfather, brothers and sisters, and scores of assorted children.

The youngest member of the clan is Laura's 1-month-old baby. The oldest is their 75-year-old grandfather.

The sour fragrance of cabbage and unwashed diapers permeates the house.

Laura, 23, was abandoned by her husband. She has no idea where he is.

Harriet, 24, divorced her husband.

The women tried living by themselves for awhile, but soon learned that their anemic welfare checks made such an arrangement practically impossible.

Because the family owns no car, they rarely go out. There are no movie theaters or any type of commercial entertainment in Menominee County. (There aren't even any doctors in the county.)

Entertainment consists of watching, in staggered shifts, the one television set.

William La Rock, Jr., 30, and his wife, Mary, 32, live with their three small children (ages 3, 2, and 1) in a shabby two-room shack which contains running insects instead of running water.

Each day La Rock drives to a small stream 3 miles from his house to fill a bucket with water. Often there are others at the stream with similar purposes.

La Rock was laid off from his job at the lumbermill last year and has been on welfare since. He occasionally works part time with the highway department.

The La Rocks said they were planning to leave Menominee this fall and move to Milwaukee.

"This is my home and I'll always love it, but there's nothing here for me anymore," he said. "At least I'll be able to find work in Milwaukee."

La Rock said that in the last year, 15 of his relatives moved to other cities in the Midwest.

More and more, the young Indians of Menominee County are leaving the land of their ancestors in order to survive.

BELOIT DAILY NEWS PRAISES SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Beloit Daily News, which is an outstanding Wisconsin newspaper, has commented on the sense of responsibility of the Nation's students. In view of all the criticism that has been leveled at the students of the Nation, this kind of thoughtful and objective praise by a highly respected newspaper should be called to the Nation's attention. It reads:

GOOD WORD FOR STUDENTS

Much is being said and written about young people going to the dogs in a handbasket, especially on college campuses. Perhaps college presidents are in the best position to know how college students are behaving, and one of them thinks he detects "an increasing maturity in the Nation's students." He is Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University at Athens.

"Today's students," he says, "regard college not as a haven from responsibility but as a training ground for citizenship. They see themselves as the conscience of the Nation; they are supplying the energy for needed social change."

One thing is certain, stresses Alden: More students are going into teaching, social work and politics, fewer into business. The reason is that they can live comfortably in almost any career they choose. Satisfaction, then, not money, becomes the deciding factor.

"As I look at today's students," says Alden, "I am deeply moved by their maturity. It is fortunate that they are accepting responsibility at such an early age, for already the torch of leadership is being passed to them."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM—THOUGHTFUL COMMENTS BY STUDENTS OF THE HISTORY CLASS OF CUSTER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL IN MILES CITY, MONT., AND REPLY BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the members of Mr. Gray's junior year American history class in Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont., have written me recently to present their views on the situation in Vietnam and to ask me to state mine. These young men and women and their teacher, Mr. Gray, are to be commended for encouraging serious discussion and analysis of this issue. Their thoughtful comments in these letters give reassuring evidence that as the years go by Montana and the United States will continue to be blessed with an informed and responsible citizenry.

My reply to their request may be of some interest to others, and I therefore read it, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1965.

DEAR ———: I have received your letter and a number of other letters from your classmates concerning Vietnam. You express your views and you ask me to express mine on this very serious question.

First, I want to commend your teacher, Mr. Gray, for encouraging this discussion and I want to compliment you for participating in it in a most intelligent and mature way. I have gained a great deal in understanding from reading your letters.

Now let me state my views to you on Vietnam, as you requested.

The war in Vietnam is a war among Vietnamese but Americans are becoming more and more involved in the fighting. Scarcely a week goes by without a report of several American soldiers being killed or wounded. Each life is precious and each death a tragedy. But if we look at this situation fully, we will see that we are still not involved in the kind of conflict which we experienced in World War II or even in Korea. The casualties among Americans in those other conflicts would sometimes equal or surpass in 1 day what we have borne in Vietnam over the past several years.

In other words, the American involvement in the conflict in Vietnam is still far short of what it was in those other recent wars with which you are familiar, I am sure, from your class studies or the experiences of your own families.

Yet, the fighting in Vietnam could grow into another Korea or another world war. Some people say: "Well, why not? Let's go in and get it over with quickly." The answer is that that is not an answer at all. A war in Asia could last for many years, spread further and further and bring millions of casualties and cause widespread devastation and destruction. In my view, we owe it, not only to the rest of the world, but to our own people to do whatever can honorably be done to prevent that kind of tragedy and suffering.

But it is going to take two sides to prevent a larger war from developing out of Vietnam. And it is going to take two sides to bring to an end even the small war which is now in progress in Vietnam. If it is going to be an honorable end, it means that the people who live in South Vietnam have got to have reasonable security and a reasonable opportunity to decide what they want for themselves.

That is the reason why Americans were sent into Vietnam in the first place—to help the Vietnamese people. It is their country and it is still their war and I hope that it can be kept that way. I would not like to see the United States involved in Vietnam any longer than it takes to help bring about a just solution which secures the freedom of South Vietnam. I would want to see the fighting, not extended, but ended just as soon as possible on that basis.

That is the way the situation looks to me. Once again, I would like to compliment you and your classmates and your teacher for pursuing this discussion and to thank you for bringing me into it by your letters.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the Custer County High School students who wrote letters to me on the situation in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the list of students was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Jim Beardsley, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Linda Bergerson, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Jerianne Chesum, Box 119, Miles City, Mont.

Virginia Clendenen, 809 South Sewell, Miles City, Mont.

Susan Enghusen, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Bill Hildenbrand, 216 North Eighth, Miles City, Mont.

Laura Jan Huntsicker, 412 South Center, Miles City, Mont.

Robert J. Kelley, 908 Woodbury, Miles City, Mont.

Rick Kouba, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Pat Mackenzie, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Barbie Petersohn, 1910 North Jordan, Miles City, Mont.

Lynn Ronning, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Carol Shook, 713 South Cottage Grove Ave., Miles City, Mont.

Linda Sterling, Route 1, Box 274, Miles City, Mont.

Anita Strub, 811 Wells, Miles City, Mont.

Jack Whitten, 2116 Main, Miles City Mont.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO ON THE COLORADO SALINITY PROBLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the friendly and sympathetic atmosphere which exists between the Republic of Mexico and the United States has helped to make it possible to work out a solution to another long-standing irritant in our relations. It has just been announced that an agreement between the two nations covering the Colorado salinity problem has been achieved. It follows a 1963 treaty on the El Chamizal and ranks with it as an outstanding example of a solution to a complex and long-standing international difficulty worked out by the processes of reason in a setting of mutual accommodation and mutual respect.

The water salinity problem on the Colorado River has caused considerable economic hardship to Mexican farmers who live near the border areas in the Mexicali Valley and who depend on the waters of the Colorado to irrigate their fields. And, of course, the utilization of the river is of immense importance in the agriculture and other activities of the Southwest region of our own Nation.

The new agreement is an equitable answer to the difficulty. It is expected to make sufficient fresh water available to both Mexicans and Americans living in the area served by the Colorado River.

Many months of hard work by Mexican and United States negotiators have gone into completing this settlement. The Governors of seven American States were consulted at every step of the negotiations and each gave their cooperation in making a solution possible. Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann, U.S. Ambassador Anthony Freeman, U.S. Border Commissioner Joseph Freidkin and his staff, Terrance G. Leonhardy and T. R. Martin of the Department of State, and Robert Sayre of the White House staff, represented the United States in the protracted negotiations. The main burden of the Mexican point of view was carried by former Ambassador Antonio Carrillo Flores, now Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Commissioner David Herrera Jordan. All of these men labored long and hard in working out a compromise. They have made a great contribution in the spirit of good neighborliness embodied in the Charter of Punta del Este. The Mexican-United States parliamentary meetings of the past several years have also made a profound contribution to this achievement not only by increasing the mutual understanding of the problem of Colorado salinity through discussions among the legislators of both countries but also by developing a high degree of reciprocal sympathy with respect to the whole range of relations between Mexico and the United States. The work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has headed the Senate group of the U.S. delegation, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking Republican in the U.S. Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Chairman of the Latin American Affairs subcommittee, and all the others on the delegation has been outstanding in this connection.

Still other problems exist between Mexico and the United States but the augury for their friendly and mutually beneficial settlement is encouraging. Needless to say if a similar spirit of reasonable amicability characterized our relations all over the world, the goal of world peace would be furthered immeasurably.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "United States, Mexico Reach Pact on River Water," published in the New York Herald Tribune on March 23, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT IN THE COLORADO: UNITED STATES, MEXICO REACH PACT ON RIVER WATER

(By Barnard L. Collier, Latin-American correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—The United States and Mexico reached final agreement yesterday on the touchy problem posed by the claim that the United States was pouring crop-killing salt water into Mexico's part of the Colorado River.

In a White House statement yesterday, President Johnson announced that he had approved an agreement worked out by the International Boundary and Water Commission. It will allow Mexico to control the salinity of the water flowing into irrigation ditches in the Mexicali Valley.

The agreement provides for a U.S.-built extension of an existing drainage canal which will divert salt-laden water from a U.S. irrigation project east of Yuma, Ariz., away from the Mexican irrigation system when the Mexicans choose to do so.

"The agreement has been considered by the Governors of the Colorado River Basin States and by the chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees," said the President, "and all have agreed to it."

The diversion project is expected to cost the United States about $65 million. If Congress speeds additional appropriations, the project will be finished by next October—the period when the Colorado flows least and saltiest into Mexico.

Among the nearly 300,000 Mexicans in the rich Mexicali Valley just below the California border, the angry cry of "sal"—salt—has long signified anti-Yankeeism. In the last 5 years, Leftists and Communists rallied peasants and farmers to protest and riot.

The dispute dates to shortly after the 1944 treaty between the United States and Mexico, which guarantees Mexico at least 1.5 million acre feet of the Colorado River's water each year. (An acre-foot is the amount of water needed to cover 1 acre of land to the depth of 1 foot.)

That quantity, the negotiators knew, was sufficient for future irrigation purposes in the cotton-growing valley. But even then they realized the quality of the water would some day become a sticky issue.

The Colorado River water that flowed across the border into Mexico then contained approximately 900 parts of salt per million parts of water—a little more than is tasty, but usable nonetheless. Then more and more irrigation projects using the Colorado's water were started on the U.S. side.

The project that caused most of the trouble was the Wellton-Mohawk farm development near Yuma. There the irrigation waters from the Colorado turned desert into lush farmland. But the relatively pure water that made crops grow in Yuma area was drained back into the Colorado via the Gila River and crossed the border into Mexico laden with leached out salt.

On occasion, the Mexicans insisted, the water flowing back out of the Yuma area contained up to 20,000 parts of salt per million parts of water. (Sea water contains about 35,000 parts per million.) The Mexicans were furious.

The salt crisis finally brought a joint United States-Mexican communique in the early summer of 1962, in which President Kennedy and Mexico's President Adolfo Lopez Mateos promised to reach a permanent solution by October 1963.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation opened 12 fresh-water wells that pumped clear water into the Gila and diluted the Yuma waste water down to 4,000 parts of salt per million. By the time it mixed with the Colorado water again the salt level dropped to about 1,800 parts per million.

Still Mexico claimed that the wells alone were no permanent solution.

The Bureau of Reclamation, however, contended that the water going to Mexico was usable. If the Mexicans would lay tiles along their irrigation ditches, keeping much of the water from draining through salty soil and getting even saltier, the farms at the end of their irrigation network would have little to complain about, the Bureau said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on what has been said by the distinguished majority leader. One of the plus signs that we can put against our foreign relations these days—and we have had too few of them—is the relationship which now exists between the United States and the Republic of Mexico. At no time in history has the relationship between these two countries been more amicable and more understanding than it is today. That is because the officials of our executive branch of the Government and the representatives of our legislative branch of Government and their counterpart of the Mexican Government have been considerate and understanding in dealing with the problems which have confronted us.